

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 27, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Claims 2-5 and 7-17 were pending, claims 15 and 16 were objected to and claims 2-5, 7-14 and 17 were rejected. By this Response, claim 7 has been canceled, and claims 2 and 8-15 have been amended. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner indicated that claims 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 15 so has been rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of its base claim. Claims 8-14 all have been amended to depend from claim 15. Therefore, all of claims 8-17 overcome the cited art and should be allowed.

Claim 7 has been canceled. Therefore, its rejections are moot.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida (US 6,301,278), claims 3 and 4 as being unpatentable over Uchida in view of Cohen (US 5,615,224), and claim 5 as being unpatentable over Uchida in view of Kimizuka (US 6,633,598).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 has been amended to require that the heat sink includes a groove for securing an optical fiber. None of the cited art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests that the heat sink includes a groove for securing an optical fiber. Consequently, the claimed invention set forth in claim 2 is novel and unobvious.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should properly be withdrawn. Since claims 3 and 4 depend on claim 2, the rejections of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should likewise be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, obviate the remaining rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, Applicant respectfully urges that all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should properly be withdrawn.

Request for Interview

Applicants respectfully request either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300**, Attorney Docket No. **033035M143**.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: December 7, 2007
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300 Facsimile: (202) 263-4329